

1 conducted a review of Appellant's duties and responsibilities, and by letter dated December 3,
2 1999, she informed Appellant that his position was properly allocated to the Control Systems
3 Technician classification. By letter dated December 30, 1999, Appellant appealed this
4 determination to the director of the Department of Personnel. On May 10, 2000, Paul L. Peterson,
5 Personnel Hearings Officer, conducted an allocation review and by letter dated June 14, 2000, he
6 informed Appellant that his position should be allocated to the class of Electrician. On July 3,
7 2000, Appellant filed exceptions with the Personnel Appeals Board to the determination of the
8 director of the Department of Personnel.

9
10 **Summary of Appellant's Argument.** Appellant disagrees that a majority of his work falls within
11 the Electrician job class definition and he takes exception to the designee's statement that a majority
12 of his duties do not fall within any of the Electronic Technician specifications. Appellant argues
13 that he performs a variety of complex work that is specifically related to electronics and he asserts
14 that one of the Electronic classes would have been a more appropriate class on a best fit basis.
15 Appellant asserts that 50 percent of his duties involve Electronic Technician duties. Appellant also
16 takes exception to the designee's determination that the Electrician class allows for both work in
17 electric and electronic systems and he asserts that very little electronics work is included in the
18 Electrician specification. Appellant contends during the designee's review, he provided additional
19 manuals which the designee failed to review and that the designee also failed to contact his
20 supervisor to gather additional information.

21
22 **Summary of Respondent's Argument.** Respondent argues that Appellant is appropriately
23 classified as an Electrician based on a majority of his duties. Respondent argues it took an in-depth
24 look at the majority of Appellant's duties and found that the work he performs is typically work
25 assigned to electricians who work at institutions. Respondent argues that the majority of
26 Appellant's duties encompass a large variety of electrical systems rather than work specifically

1 performed on electronic components as intended by the Electronics Technician and Electronic
2 Technician 2 specifications. Respondent argues that the intent of the Electronics Technician
3 classification was to address monitoring and surveillance systems used at the newly formed Special
4 Offender Center which exceeded what an electrician could work on. Respondent argues that the
5 majority of Appellant's duties do not fall within the Electronics Technician or Electronic
6 Technician 2 specification.

7
8 **Primary Issue.** Whether the director's determination that Appellant's position is properly allocated
9 to the Electrician classification should be affirmed.

10
11 **Relevant Classifications.** Electrician, class code 70370; Electronic Technician 2, class code
12 72740; Electronics Technician, class code 72950.

13
14 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best
15 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a
16 measurement of the volume of work performed, nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that
17 work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in
18 similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular
19 position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the
20 class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v.
21 Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

22
23 Position allocations are "based upon an investigation of duties and responsibilities assigned and/or
24 performed and other information and recommendations." (WAC 356-20-020). Because a current
25 and accurate description of a position's duties and responsibilities is documented in an approved
26 Classification Questionnaire, the CQ becomes the basis for allocation of a position. Position

1 allocations are made on a best fit basis. An allocation determination must be based on the overall
2 duties and responsibilities, as documented in the CQ. The position questionnaire submitted by
3 Appellant for review of his position represents a current, complete and accurate description of his
4 duties and responsibilities and Appellant's supervisor and the department head both concurred with
5 the information in the position questionnaire. Therefore, we are basing our review and decision on
6 this approved position questionnaire.

7
8 Appellant works at the Fircrest School and is supervised by a Plant Manager 3. Appellant performs
9 journey level work on Fircrest School's electronic security systems, control panels, fire alarm
10 systems and other monitoring, measuring and sensing devices. A major responsibility of
11 Appellant's position is to troubleshoot and repair electronic components.

12
13 The Electronic Technician 2 classification encompasses positions that perform "skilled journey-
14 level work in the operation, maintenance, modification, troubleshooting, adjusting, testing, repair
15 and installation of **electronic air monitoring systems and devices or other scientific monitoring**
16 **and measuring equipment** (emphasis added). Appellant does not perform work on air or scientific
17 monitoring device systems as intended for allocation to the Electronic Technician 2 classification.
18 Therefore, Appellant should not be reallocated to the Electronic Technician 2 classification.

19
20 The Electrician classification encompasses positions that perform skilled electrical work in the
21 installation, modification, maintenance and repair of wiring, electric machines, switches and
22 controls, various types of circuitry, motors and equipment. In performing his overall duties and
23 responsibilities, Appellant does some electrician duties. However, the type of systems for which
24 Appellant is responsible go beyond those intended to be encompassed by this classification.
25 Furthermore, Appellant's CQ, which was approved by both his supervisor and the department head,
26 indicates Appellant spends only 20 percent of his time installing, maintaining, troubleshooting,

1 repairing (replacing integrated circuits, transistors, capacitors, resistors) and testing electrical and
2 electronic systems. Therefore, the Electrician classification is not the best fit for Appellant's overall
3 duties and responsibilities.

4
5 The specification for the Electronics Technician classification states that incumbents perform
6 skilled journey level work which includes installing, maintaining, repairing and testing electrical
7 and electronic systems used in security and alarm surveillance and instructing personnel in the
8 proper operation and minor maintenance of this equipment. The typical work for this class includes
9 the installation and maintenance of internal security systems, including electronic surveillance
10 systems, and conducting inspections and tests to ensure the security systems are functional. The
11 typical work also includes recommending purchases of security devices, consulting with
12 contractors, and instructing employees in the use and repair of security systems. This class
13 specifically addresses the maintenance and repair of electrical and electronic systems used in
14 security and alarm surveillance such as those used at Fircrest School.

15
16 Fifty percent of Appellant's work responsibilities are best described as skilled journey-level work
17 which includes the operation, maintenance, modification, troubleshooting, adjusting, testing, repair
18 and installation of electronic security systems, control panels, fire alarm systems and other
19 monitoring, measuring and sensing devices. In addition, Appellant spends 10 percent of his time
20 conducting inspections of the security system and testing and evaluation of new electronic
21 equipment. The remainder of Appellant's duties includes providing feedback on the purchase of
22 new electronic systems, providing input to contractors on the installation of systems and instructing
23 personnel in the proper operation, maintenance and minor repair of systems and equipment. These
24 duties are best described by the Electronic Technician classification. Therefore, Appellant's
25 position should be reallocated to this classification.

1 **Conclusion.** Appellant's appeal should be granted, and his position should be reallocated to the
2 Electronics Technician classification.

3
4 **ORDER**

5 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal of Wagdi Hafzalla is granted, the
6 Director's determination is reversed, and Appellant's position is reallocated to the class of
7 Electronics Technician.

8
9 DATED this _____ day of _____, 2001.

10
11 WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

12
13 _____
Gerald L. Morgen, Vice Chair

14
15 _____
Leana D. Lamb, Member